



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,973	12/05/2001	Paul R. Nash	112076-138354	8414
25943 7590 08/01/2007 SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			EXAMINER PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
			ART UNIT 2151	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,973

Applicant(s)

NASH ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-20 and 22-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-20,22-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed May 4, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 5, 19, 23, 35, 40, 50, 54, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More specifically, claims 1, 5, 19, 23, 35, 40, 50, 54, 64, and 65 similarly recite "amplifying information of the first information page" and "abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page". Examiner was unable to find support for this limitation in the application as originally filed. Instead, examiner noted applicant's specification only discloses determining if a locator based condition is met, the locator based condition being a URL pattern, (see pg. 5, lines 9-17, also see Fig. 5). This raises doubt as to the possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing. In order to advance prosecution, examiner has interpreted the claims as best understood.

4. Claims 1, 5, 19, 23, 35, 40, 50, 54, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. More specifically, claims 1, 5, 19, 23, 35, 40, 50, 54, 64, and 65 similarly recite "amplifying information of the first information page" and "abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page". Examiner was unable to find support for this limitation in the application as originally filed. Instead, examiner noted applicant's specification only discloses determining if a locator based condition is met, the locator based condition being a URL pattern, (see pg. 5, lines 9-17, also see Fig. 5). These teachings alone would not enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention as currently claimed. In order to advance prosecution, examiner is interpreting the claims as best understood.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-65 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-12, 16-20, 22, 25-27, 31-39, 42-44, 48-53, 56-58, 62-64, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0054064 in view of Kanevsky, U.S. Patent 6,300,947.

8. In considering claims 1 and 19, Kannan teaches a method and apparatus comprising: determining based at least in part on content of a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page, said content of the locator identifying the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be retrieved, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, paragraph 91, page 14, paragraph 185); and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, 91, page 14, paragraph 185).

Although the teachings of Kannan disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: amplifying information of the first information page, and said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first

information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page.

Nevertheless, Kannan does disclose said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, 91, page 14, paragraph 185). Furthermore, in analogous teachings Kanevsky discloses amplifying information of a first information page to be retrieved based at least in part on content of a locator, (col. 7, lines 10-33).

Thus given the teachings of Kanevsky, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to disclose amplifying information of the first information page, and said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page. This would have advantageously provided a customized information page to a user based on the type of device the user was utilizing to access the information page, (Kanevsky, col. 1, lines 57-65).

9. In considering claims 2, 20, 36, and 51, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a uniform resource locator (URL). See page 7, paragraph 91.

10. In considering claims 4 and 22, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a URL, and said locator based condition is a URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance and said determining comprises analyzing whether said URL satisfies the URL based condition. See page 7, paragraph 91.

11. In considering claim 9, although Kannan discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, Kannan fails to expressly disclose: downloading the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system.

Nevertheless, Kannan does disclose a means for downloading the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system, where Kannan discloses downloading active content onto the client system to support live customer service, (page 2, paragraph 22, page 6, paragraph 74).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Kannan, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the teachings of Kannan provide a means for downloading the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system, (page 2, paragraph 22, page 6, paragraph 74). One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that having the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications at either the server or the client would be a field of

use limitation, and not of patentable distinction, as having the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications at either the server or the client would not change the functionality of the teachings of Kannan or applicants claimed invention.

12. In considering claims 10 and 25, Kannan further teaches the information browsing assistance comprising displaying a second information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

13. In considering claims 11, 26, 43, and 57, Kannan teaches the second information page effectively replacing the first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

14. In considering claims 12, 27, 44, and 58, Kannan teaches a second information page additionally displayed complementing a first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

15. In considering claims 16 and 31, it is inherent in the teachings of Kannan that a request to retrieve and display the first information page is received, the request including the locator. See page 2, paragraph 22, page 7, paragraph 91.

16. In considering claims 17, 32, 48, and 62, Kannan teaches in response to said receive of a request, notifying a monitor function of a browser helper of said receipt, (page. 2, paragraph 22); and said monitor function, in response to receipt of said notification, notifying an analyzer function of said browser helper, which performs said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance, (page 7, paragraphs 83-84).

17. In considering claims 18, 33, and 63, Kannan teaches executing the monitor function as an extension of a browser, and executing the analyzer function external to the browser. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

18. In considering claim 34, Kannan teaches the apparatus being a selected one of a wireless telephone, a palm sized personal digital assistant, a notebook computer, a desktop computer, and a set top box. See Fig. 1.

19. In considering claims 35 and 64, Kannan teaches a method and computer readable medium comprising: receiving a request from a client system for executable instructions designed to enable the client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance based at least in part on content of a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, said content of the locator identifying said first information page and a location from which said first information page is to be retrieved, (page 2, paragraphs 22 and 25, page 7, paragraph 91, page 14, paragraph

185); and in response, providing said client system with said requested executable instructions, (page 2, paragraph 22).

Although the teachings of Kannan disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: amplifying information of the first information page, and said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page.

Nevertheless, Kannan does disclose said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, 91, page 14, paragraph 185). Furthermore, in analogous teachings Kanevsky discloses amplifying information of a first information page to be retrieved based at least in part on content of a locator, (col. 7, lines 10-33).

Thus given the teachings of Kanevsky, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to disclose amplifying information of the first information page, and said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page. This would have advantageously provided a customized information page to a user

based on the type of device the user was utilizing to access the information page,
(Kanevsky, col. 1, lines 57-65).

20. In considering claim 37, Kannan teaches performing a selected one of (a) enabling the client system to determine whether the locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enabling the client system to provide said locator to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system whether the locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

21. In considering claim 38, Kannan teaches the server system being the same server system performing the receiving and the responsive providing. See Fig. 5A, and Fig. 6.

22. In considering claim 39, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a URL and said locator based condition is a URL based condition, (page 7, paragraph 91); and said executable instructions designed to perform a selected one of (a) enable the client system to determine whether said URL satisfies the URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance, and (b) enable the client system to provide said URL to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system whether the locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

23. In considering claim 42, Kannan further teaches either (a) said executable instructions designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page, or (b) the method further comprising a server system providing said information browsing assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system. See page 2, paragraph 25.

24. In considering claim 49, Kannan teaches either (a) said browser helper further includes said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance, in response to receipt of said notification, or (b) the method further includes a server having said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance for said client system, in response to receipt of said notification from said client system. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

25. In considering claims 50 and 65, Kannan teaches a server system and computer readable medium comprising: storage medium having stored therein at least a selected one of (a) first executable instructions designed to enable a first client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to itself based at least in part on content of a first locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, and second executable instructions designed to provide the first client system with said first executable instructions in response to a request by the first client

system for said first executable instructions, and (b) third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to a second client system based at least in part on content of a second locator of a second information page requested to be retrieved and displayed for said second client system, said content of the first and second locators identifying said first and second information pages, and a first and a second location from which said first and second information pages are to be retrieved respectively, (page 2, paragraph 22); and at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute at least one of said second and third executable instructions, (page 2, paragraph 22).

Although the teachings of Kannan disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: amplifying information of the first information page, and said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page.

Nevertheless, Kannan does disclose said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, 91, page 14, paragraph 185). Furthermore, in analogous teachings Kanevsky discloses amplifying information of a first information page to be retrieved based at least in part on content of a locator, (col. 7, lines 10-33).

Thus given the teachings of Kanevsky, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to disclose amplifying information of the first information page, and said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page. This would have advantageously provided a customized information page to a user based on the type of device the user was utilizing to access the information page, (Kanevsky, col. 1, lines 57-65).

26. In considering claim 52, Kannan teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether the first locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client system whether the second locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met See page 7, paragraph 91.

27. In considering claim 53, Kannan teaches said first and second locators comprising a first and second URL, respectively and said first and second locator based conditions are a first and second URL based condition, respectively, (page 7, paragraph 91).

28. In considering claim 56, Kannan further teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page, (page 2, paragraph 25); and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to provide said information browsing assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system. See page 2, paragraph 25.

29. Claims 5-8, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, 55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of Kanevsky, and further in view of Wolfe, U.S. Patent 6,397,246.

30. In considering claims 5, 23, 40, and 54, the combined teachings of Kannan and Kanevsky further provide a means for said URL based condition comprising a URL pattern abstracting a plurality of URLs of the plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page, (Kannan page 7, paragraph 91, Kanevsky, col. 7, lines 10-33); and, the analysis comprising matching a URL against URL history, (Kannan, page 7, paragraph 91).

Although the modified teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: matching the URL against URL patterns.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Wolfe teaches a method and system for processing document requests in a network comprising: a URL based condition

Art Unit: 2151

comprising a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, (col. 5, lines 21-31); and, an analysis means comprising matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns, (col. 5, lines 32-50).

Thus, given the teachings of Wolfe, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to further modify the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe in order to have each URL based condition comprise a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, and the analysis comprise matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns. Doing so would have provided an efficient means for providing assistance specifically tailored for the user depending on URL patterns entered by the user for an information page, Wolfe, col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 20, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

31. In considering claims 6, 24, 41, and 55, the teachings of Wolfe provide a means for each URL pattern to comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information to be provided, wherein matching comprises traversing the tree data structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe to have each URL pattern comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided, and said matching comprise traversing said tree data structure, for the same reasons indicated in consideration of claims 5, 23, 40, and 54.

32. In considering claim 7, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for downloading the tree data structure from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

33. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for downloading the URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

34. Claims 13, 28, 45, 59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of Kanvesky, and further in view of Peercy et al. (hereinafter Peercy), U.S. Patent 5,960,429, (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

35. In considering claims 13, 28, 45, and 59, although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: the second information page comprising a plurality of locators.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Peercy teaches: displaying a plurality of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from which the identified information pages are to be retrieved, (col. 1, lines 45-59).

Thus, given the teachings of Peercy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Peercy in order to have the second information page comprise a plurality

of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from which the identified information pages of the second information page are to be retrieved. This would have provided an efficient means for giving the user a choice of popular information pages to choose from for browsing assistance, Peercy, col. 1, lines 35-41, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

36. Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, 61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of Kanevsky, and further in view of Blumenthal, U.S. Patent 6,026,409, (see Applicant IDS).

37. In considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60, although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Blumenthal teaches: modifying an environment attribute of a browsing environment, (col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6).

Thus, given the teachings of Blumenthal, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Blumenthal in order to have the information browsing assistance comprise modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment within which the determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed. This would have provided an effective means for demarcating points of

interest in the browsing environment that correspond to the information browsing assistance, Blumenthal, col. 5, lines 45-47, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

38. In considering claims 15, 30, 47, and 61, Blumenthal teaches one or more environment attributes comprising one or more of a display resolution attribute, a color resolution attribute, a font selection attribute, a media player preference attribute, an add-on selection attribute, and a plug-in selection attribute. See Blumenthal, col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6. One of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of Kannan with Blumenthal for the reasons indicated in consideration of claims 14, 29, 46, and 60.

Conclusion

39. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2151

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is 571-272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Wallace can be reached on 571-272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HP/
7/26/07

V. Martin Wallace
VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
PRIMARY EXAMINER